DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 303 SO 020 323

AUTHOR Alexandre, Laurien
TITLE International Issues, Media Coverage and Public Ignorance: or, So, Where Is Africa, Anyway?
PUB DATE 22 Sep 89
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Constitutional Government and the Development of an Enlightened Citizenry (Los Angeles, CA, September 16-22 1989).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Democracy; Information Dissemination; International Education; Knowledge Level; *Mass Media Effects; *Mass Media Role; Media Research; News Media; Political Attitudes; *Public Opinion; *Social Influences; Television; *World Affairs

ABSTRACT

It is commonplace to lament the lack of knowledge about world issues and events exhibited by U.S. citizens. Communication scholars criticize the mass media's poor coverage of world affairs and stereotypic portrayals of distant lands and leaders. Despite sophisticated communications networks, U.S. mass media provide only a limited window on the world, and the view outside is fragmented, partial and prejudicial. Surveys have repeatedly revealed the global illiteracy of U.S. citizens and their fear or hostility to foreign governments and ideas. While the diversity of media seems to encourage political debate and the public's involvement, the corporatized, homogenized newspaper chains seem to aim for the lowest common denominator of public intelligence and political discourse. It is precisely the consumption of trivialized news stories and fragmented fictions that overload viewers, confuse media consumers, and often narcotize rather than energize. The concept of news favors personality over issue, event over content, and official positions over popular grievances. The classical theory of liberal democracy is that media will enable people to develop informed opinions that will be translated into the nation's political will. Educators have a challenge to reveal that mass media news is a cleverly contrived social construction. The monopoly ownership of the public information channels must be democratized. Cultural exchange and cross-national dialogue should be encouraged. U.S. citizens must realize that their lives are ultimately affected by international issues that are not being reported on the networks. A list of 14 references is included. (PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314303

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES, MEDIA COVERAGE AND PUBLIC IGNORANCE: OR, SO, WHERE IS AFRICA, ANYWAY?

by
Laurien Alexandre, Ph.D.
September 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
LAURIEN ALEXANDRE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 323

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Laurien Alexandre, Ph.D.
September 1989

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES, MEDIA COVERAGE AND PUBLIC IGNORANCE: OR, SO, WHERE IS AFRICA, ANYWAY?

It has become commonplace for Americans to lament their countrymen's (and women's) lack of knowledge about and interest in world places, issues and events. Such ignorance seems to reflect the privileged posture of a nation and a people who have, for decades, believed themselves to be the most powerful and the most superior among the world's inhabitants. That privilege, however, is rapidly and radically changing and demands for a new American awareness are being heard.

It has also become rather commonplace among communication scholars to criticize the mass media's poor coverage of world affairs and stereotypic portrayals of distant lands and leaders. Despite advanced technological capabilities and sophisticated transnational communications networks, American mass media provide only a limited window on the world, and the view outside is, indeed, fragmented, partial and prejudicial. Today I am going to examine the relationship between media performance and American's knowledge and images of the world. I will be suggesting that the correlation is strong.

First, however, a few qualifications are necessary. Given the brief amount of time and the nature of the subject matter, my talk is a general overview given more to the speculative than the quantifiable. Secondly, I

limit my discussion of media performance to television and not other, perhaps more intriguing forms of media entertainment such as filmatic wide screen images of foreign lands. Finally, my discussion focuses primarily on television news coverage of international issues, and not other televised formats which also provide images and visions of other countries.

There is justification for a focus on television, and the subcategory of network news. Over the past few decades, television has become THE dominant vehicle for interpreting national and international politics to the U.S. citizenry. It is through the mass media, particularly network television news, that the State and decison-makers make themselves visible to most people on a regular basis. Recent studies show that network television news is THE major source of news for the majority of people; for 70 percent of all Americans, it is the only news. Moreover, approximately 50 percent of all Americans believe television news to be more credible than print.

With this said, let us begin our discussion of media, international issues, and public ignorance.

WHAT WE DON'T KNOW

We are unquestionably a globally illiterate people. Roughly 30 percent of those responding to a recent survey conducted by Interaction and the Overseas Development Council could not name one major problem facing Latin American or Asian countries.[1] Additionally, only one in three could correctly answer the following three questions: which two countries are participants in the SALT and START talks; does the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. belong to NATO; and, is the United States supporting the Sandinistas or the Contras in Nicaragua.

A 1987 survey of high schools senior in eight U.S. cities revealed sombering gaps in knowledge about basic international information. Sixty-three percent could not name all seven continents; 25 percent of those sur-

veyed in Dallas, Texas, could not identify the country that borders them to the south; and, almost 60 percent were unable to name Vietnam as the Southeast Asian country from which the U.S. withdrew in 1975.[2] These results, literally and metaphorically, indicate that Americans are unaware of their own history, unfamiliar with their most direct neighbors, and at a loss as to their place in the world. Finally, fulfilling that rather ancient adage that fear feeds on ignorance, over one-half of American students surveyed believed that foreign governments and their ideas are dangerous to America. It is obvious that this ignorance, this fearfulness, this hostility to others, represents a threat to domestic democracy, to international cooperation and to global peace.

Report after national report has demonstrated this global illiteracy and recommended responses. The National Governor's Report (1989), for example, recommended that our nation's schools improve their international education and foreign language teaching in order to produce a generation of internationally competent businessmen and women.[3] Other recent national reports have also cited the failure of school's to adequately prepare our youth for an interdependent age. While there is validity in this approach, this paper will turn, not to the schools and formal education, but to the mass media, perhaps the preeminent educator in contemporary American society.

More of our time is spent with the mass media than inside classrooms. We learn behaviors, model attitudes and envision futures based, to a large extent, on the images, ideas and information presented and re-presented in our ominipresent media constellation. It is estimated that the average American household has the television on seven hours daily; the average American -- whomever that might be -- consumes close to four hours daily of television. If we were to add the time spent watching films, listening to radio and, yes, even reading an occassional newspaper, we must come to the conclusion that if our people are, indeed, globally illiterate, the mass media must have some-

thing to do with it.

It would, however, be ludicrous and far too simplistic to conclude from these comments that television is to blame for all society's evils. I am not making an argument for mass media as the factor "in dominance" determining our culture, politics and the strength of our democracy. While this talk does focus exclusively on media's relationship to awareness about international issues, I believe the media complex to be in "co-determinance" with other elements of our society's structural and ideological apparatus including, but not confined to, the educational system, religion, the free enterprise system, and the family.

AMERICA'S MEDIA

Americans live in a vast information and communications empire. The number of media outlets is staggering: approximately 1,700 daily newspapers, 7,000 weekly papers, 4,500 AM radio stations, 3,000 commercial FM stations, 1,100 educational FM stations, and 750 commercial TV stations. This doesn't even take into account thousands of cable systems with multiple channel offerings, as well as book publishing, speciality magazines, motion pictures, and advertising. It should be clearly stated, however, that this spectacular quantity does not inherently satisfy diversity. Our daily metropolitan newspapers, for example, are not comparable to the diverse political partisanship manifested, in Italy's numerous national and local daily party, religious, labor and commercial press. Whereas that diversity seems to encourage political debate and the public's involvement, our corporatized, sanitized, homogenized newspaper chains seem to aim for the lowest common denominator of public intelligence and poitical discourse.

In his landmark 1987 book, *The Media Monopoly*, scholar Ben Bagdikian concludes that "despite the 25,000 media outlets in the U.S. today, 29 corporations control most of the business in daily newspapers, magazines, television,

books and motion pictures."[4] In his 1983 study, five years earlier, Bagdikian found 50 corporations to be in control of our nation's information industry. Thus, the concentration of ownership of our public information is accelerating at a phenomenal and alarming rate. While further examination of the issue of media monopolization is not within this paper's scope, it is necessary to recognize that the media diversity which is touted as the lifeblood of American democracy's free marketplace of ideas, is, in reality, more mythic than actual. That diversity of ownership does not exist, and that many of the media transnational monopolies have economic and political interests around the world does, I believe, have an impact on the quantity of foreign news coverage, the quality of that coverage, the emphasis or de-emphasis given to some coverage, and the perspectives represented in the images and information we receive about the world.

It is tempting to conclude, and perhaps almost common sensical to assume, that if members of such a mass mediated society like ours are ignorant of world affairs, then they have simply not bothered to become informed or to utilize the media which surrounds their every waking moment. How else can we make sense of the paradox that one of the most sophisticated communications societies in the world is populated by poorly informed, globally ignorant people? Yet, a number of media scholars are beginning to offer an answer which turns common sense on its head. It is precisely the consumption of trivialized news stories and fragmented fictions which overload viewers, confuse media consumers and often, in the 1948 words of sociologists Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton, narcotize rather than energize. More recently, W. Lance Bennett in *News: The Politics of Illusion,* suggests that the more news consumed, the more narrow and stereotypic the resulting understanding.[5] Bennett concludes that, given the fragmented and personalized presentation of trivialized news, coupled with a dependence on a narrow group of powerful political and economic interests, it is virtually impossible for the media consumer to make sense of the world.

ALL THE NEWS THAT'S FIT

It is necessary to first make some introductory comments about the conventional definition of news itself before discussing the specifics of foreign news coverage. For decades, it was in vogue to talk of news as a mirror held up to the world; thus an objective image of events was reflected back to media consumers, albeit a truncated version. It was a terribly simple and erroneous model which failed to grasp, among other things, the complex phenomenon of news selectivity. Today, media scholars refer to news as a socially produced construction of reality, whose production processes are determined by exigencies internal to the profession and media institution and to those externally based on political, social and economic factors.[6] Ultimately, news is a socially constructed reality offering a way of seeing the social world. The nature of that social construction interacts in determinate and indeterminate ways on the public's image, knowledge and understanding of world issues and events.

All news coverage -- foreign and domestic -- is constructed, constrained and conformed by concepts of newsworthiness based on momentary timeliness, the unusual, the sensational, and so on. Our concept of news favors personality over issue, event over content, official positions over popular grievances, and sensational over systemic. Coverage focuses on the "spot" news of a house fire, for example, and not the root problems of unaffordable housing and overcrowding; it emphasizes the weekend gang violence but not the causes of endemic poverty, minority unemployment and racism; it exposes the individual inside-trader but not the systemic factors of greed and institutional corruption. The underlying stories are deemed too costly, too time consuming to prepare, too difficult to present visually, and not of interest to television's pampered viewers.

In the case of foreign news coverage, the sensational, the unusual and the superficial confers priority on the coup and the disaster rather than long-term issues such as development, the arms race, or North-South relations.

Given the accepted conception of news, Americans are thus presented with the political assassination but not the underlying instabilities; the murderous drug cartel but not the positive development efforts of many developing countries; the famine but not the human-made factors of transnationalized ownership of previously family-owned subsistence farms. How can our citizens make sense of a world that they know primarily through disasters, corruption and chaos?

Some media scholars view these media predelictions as resulting from technology's requirements, unforgiving deadlines, space limitations, rules of the profession and other "non-ideological" factors. Others view these predelictions as having an ideological character; technology is not neutral; professional notions of objectivity are ladened with favoritism towards "legitimate" officialdom; and, media are not passive scribes but big business unabashedly concerned with the bottom-line pursuit of news that will turn a profit. I am, as you may have guessed, of the latter school. This does not mean to say that every news story has a conscious ideological lessons imbedded in its text but, rather, that the socially-constructed world presented on the nightly news is neither an objective mirror, nor a simple whim of market supply and demands, nor a conicidence. It represents a privileged worldview, or set of worldviews which, for a variety of reasons, have dominance in the media's social construction of global reality.

The omissions and distortion of foreign news coverage are legion. Our media complex do an incredibly poor job of reporting world news in a comprehensive and understandable fashion. Study after study have concluded that foreign coverage is too limited to be satisfactory; major sections of the world are basically ignored or "symbolically annihilated"[7]; and when covered, the focus is on crises. Walter Laqueur, editor of *Washington Quarterly* lamented in a *Washington Journalism Review* article that "the quality of American foreign news coverage is worse now than it was before and just after World War II. "It is definitely not as good," noted Laquer, "as in most other countries that have a free press. Above all, there seems to be little awareness of the

true state of affairs." [8]

OUR CLOUDED WINDOW OF THE WORLD

While it is impossible in such a short talk to detail the specifics of American media's clouded window on the world, a few generalizations can be made. Studies over the past few decades illustrate the limited, partial, fragmented and often political nature of foreign news coverage. According to James Larson in his landmark 10-year study of the networks' international news, while approximately 40 percent of the evening's newscasts deal with international affairs, with a story's average length being all of 1:28 minutes, 60 percent of all those international stories referred directly to U.S. interests and involvement.[9] Are viewers to assume that a country is not noteworthy unless directly related to U.S. interests? Are audiences to believe that nothing happens in the 160-odd nations of the planet's community unless and until American interests or leaders are involved? What kind of statement does this make to viewers who are expected to evaluate the relative import of other nations' interests or who might delude themselves with an inflated sense of their own nation's omnipresence?

According to Larson, and duplicated by other scholars, a high percentage of the international news stories deal with crisis themes such as civil unrest, coups, disasters and terrorism. While the content of each of these themes could warrant indepth examination in an effort to determine their impact on the public's international awareness, I will limit myself to brief comments about two repeated themes -- international terrorism and Third World disaster.

"Terrorism" is a great media story. It involves high drama, human interest, and dramatic footage. Typically, media coverage stresses the "terror" and ignores the "ism," thereby cheating the audience of an understanding of possible political grievances motivating terrorist acts. Secondly, given

the predelictions of news coverage, single terrorist acts by radical groups such as the IRA or the PLO get blanket coverage while the state terrorism of, let's say, El Salvador's government receives far less play. And, given the dominant political consensus shared by newspeople and policymakers alike, coupled with the dependence on official Washington sources, some terrorists are inexplicably referred to as freedom fighters while others are not. What might the cumulative result of this superficial and frgamented coverage be? Can we expect media audiences to understand the conflict in Northern Ireland, or the intifada if they are primarily treated to a steady diet of inexplicably brutal and seemingly random attacks on innocent victims? Likewise, research to be detailed later, indicates that a steady diet of terror-riddened news stories can cultivate in viewers a paralyzing fear of a hostile, violent and irrational world. In such a world, only America remains safe, its borders must be protected. It is no wonder that our students voice such confused notions and unsubstantiated but powerful fears of all Arabs, all Moslems (in their minds, one in the same), or whomever.

Disasters also make great media. Take the African faminine. For over 20 years, famine in Ethiopia and other African countries was given prefunctory media attention. In fact, Black Africa is generally ignored on American television unless, and until, there is either a disaster or bloodshed. The 1984-85 famine in twelve African countries was given only slight play EXCEPT for Ethiopia which, interestingly enough, was an avowedly Marxist nation. What might we say about the impact on public consciousness of this coverage? While many acclaim the media's role in raising awareness and money for Africa's famine relief, there is another side. The continent is presented primarily in its most desperate imagery. Africa, all of it, is equated in the minds of many Americans with human tragedy and solely that. Is it any wonder that media consumers are unaware of the continent's over 50 nations, thousands of languages, centuries of history, proud cultures and some of the world's most magnificient arts? I recall one of my upper-division journalism students who was unable, when questioned, to name one positive thing in Africa, not one!

I would, by the way, also argue that the dramatic but superficial coverage of the famine left untold other important stories such as the survival struggle of post-colonial nations or the human-made factors affecting the suffering. After all, Africans have survived other famines with less devastating consequences than those of the 1980s. How many news reports explored the impact of transnational takeovers of subsistence crop lands for the production of cash crop export-oriented foodstuffs? How many examined the impact of development programs sanctioned by the World Bank or IMF? Additionally, I find it interesting that, consistent with the Cold War consensus which has framed so much foreign news coverage, an unspoken element of the famine coverage damned Marxist Ethiopia's inability to feed its people and the corruption of its leadership.

Let us talk, ever so briefly, about the geography of television's foreign news coverage. In relation to total population and number of nations, developing countries receive far less coverage than developed. According to Larson, only 25 countries are mentioned in two percent or more of the news items -- those most frequently mentioned are the USSR, England, China, West Germany and Japan[10] -- in short, the industrialized allies or the Cold War nemesis. Except for major crises, U.S. television networks have paid minimal attention to Latin America, Africa and Asia. The Third World exists not on any basis relative to parity, population or interdependence, but as exotic and violent regions which American viewers can feel thankful they do not call home. I would suggest that the impact of this geographic imbalance is sombering. Is it any wonder that Americans are geographic illiterates? Virtually three-quarters of the world is virtually annihilated from their television screens. Could not their mental map be a reflection of the broadcast map on which they travel the globe for 21.5 minutes each night?

Some scholars attribute this geographical imbalance to logistical considerations such as the location of bureaus, access to transmission facilities, hostility of host governments and the like. While such considerations do affect news gathering and suggest that the coverage of Western Europe is far more amenable than, let's say, East Africa, recognition of such circumstances is not sufficient. To understand the geography of news coverage one must also understand the geography of world power and the exigencies of foreign policy. For example, while close to half of all Latin American countries are regularly ignored, a few countries, like Nicaragua and Cuba receive a disproportionate amount of that limited time. According to a content analysis study by Waltraud Queier Morales, Latin America usually receives only one percent of the total news time on the three networks. In the early 1970s, the entire region received less than two hours of attention annually. During the 78-80 period, with upheaval and Sandinista Revolution, six hours were broadcast.[11] Had nothing been happening in Nicaragua during those previous years? What about the brutalities of the Somoza Regime? What about the underlying causes which gave rise to the Sandinistas? How are American viewers to understand Third World grievances and revolution if the fullest story is denied to them?

MEDIA AND DEMOCRACY

The classical theory of liberal democracy is that media occupy a key role as a major source of the information that citizens need to arrive at rational political judgements. Witness the First Amendment. The basic notion has been that news, information, discourse and debate will enable people to form opinions on issues and to convey their political will to the nation's policy makers. To achieve this, however, two conditions must be fulfilled. First, a whole range of relevant information needs to be available, and equally available to everyone. Secondly, news organizations need to be independent of both government and big business so that they can deliver impartial accounts of the key sources of power affecting people's daily lives. More than that, the mass media have a positive obligation to act as a Fourth Estate, a public

watchdog checking for abuses of corporate and governmental power on behalf of the wider public interest.

As has been alluded to previously, the whole range of relevant information on world places, events and issues is not available because of technological, political, economic and ideological factors. Secondly, as previously indicated, the media are not independent from big business. They ARE big business, and market forces have led to an oligarchic control over the means of public information. Additionally, as innumerable scholars have recently affirmed, neither are the mass media an independent, Fourth Estate of government. In *On Bended Knee: The Press and the Reagan Presidency*, author Mark Hertsgaard, for example, explores the degree to which the media were more handmaiden than watchdog to the Reagan political elite.[12] Thus, serious questions are raised as to the media's ability and/or interest in producing an enlightened citizenry in our liberal democracy.

We have, up to now, skirted the issue of drawing links between coverage and consciousness. I will now enter into a brief discussion of what is classically called media effects literature. Effects research has traditionally focused on individual messages empirically correlated to test immediate changes on individual behaviors, such as voting patterns. A newer school, however, explores the cumulative media effects on the quality of public discourse and the parameters of the intellectual environment. Basing myself on the notions of that latter tradition, links can be suggested between the media and public consciousness about international issues.

One particularly relevant approach established by noted media scholar George Gerbner, focuses on the "cultivation hypothesis," in which it is theorized that the more time one spends watching television, the more likely one's conception of reality can be traced to media's recurrent portrayals of life. For example, Gerbner concluded from his decade-long study that heavy television viewers (four or more hours daily), exposed to hours of violence-ridden

news and drama, view the world as a more violent place than light viewers. Gerbner found that those who view themselves living in a more violent world believe that they are more likely to be victims of violent attacks, and, therefore, tend to support more police and law and order policies. Translating these findings to the international arena, a steady diet of wars, terrorism and other international crises, likely cultivates fear of "the other" among our population and a willingness to accept policies based on traditional concepts of national security. In fact, Gerbner found that heavy viewers are more hostile to foreigners and are more likely to think that the United States will fight in another world war within a decade.[13]

Gerbner also concluded that the more people watch television, the more they place themselves as "moderates" on a highly constricted, unidimensional continuum of political beliefs from conservative to liberal. Cultivation analysis assumes that the media's impact on public consciousness is to blur traditional differences based on class, social background or party affiliation and to blend perspectives into a maintream consensus. Thus, alternative perspectives and oppositional sentiments seem to be marginalized from public discourse just as they are from media's constricted debates. Again, this has serious implications for the lifeblood of liberal democracy - a diverse marketplace of ideas and opinions.

Media scholar Peter Dahlgren amplifies on a similar notion, asserting that television news, as presented in the United States, generates "non-reflexive" viewers who sense themselves as subordinate to "officialdom" and who rarely sees themselves as social actors who make history.[14] The notion of non-reflexive viewers, similar to Herbert Marcuse's "one-dimensional" man, conjures up an image of mass publics who rarely question authority and who acquiese to official policy. Most certainly, the power elites assume and expect the media to configure adherence to dominant consensus. And, in general, they do so. It is only necessary to recall how roundly the mass media were criticized for supposedly turning the American public against the Vietnam War to illus-

trate how, the majority of time, on the majority of issues, the media adhere to the dominant line. How rare our media are truly oppositional.

Most of us in this room are not satisfied with the media's coverage of world issues and events. Most of us also worry about a disinterested and confused citizenry, so disenfranchised that only 50 percent vote for their president. Whether one accepts the argument that a disheartened, disinformed public is what the power managers desire in order to maintain their dominance or not, we here agree, I believe, that the lack of public awareness about world issues is a serious threat to domestic democracy, global cooperation and peace.

There are, however, factors which mitigate against a completely dismal projection about public awareness and the future of our democracy. For one, it is possible for any citizen with time to spare, the education to develop critical thinking skills, and a canny eye, to work out what is really going on in the world. We are, indeed, an information-rich country and, despite the privatization of information and the monopolization of media, there are alternative media sources which can be sought out. Additionally, the new communications technologies enable millions to watch CNN and other specialized non-network programs. Through them and alternative press, diverse perspectives and additional information can be gleaned.

We also need to recognize that the act of watching television or reading the newspaper is not passive. As much current literature illustrates, media consumers actively interpret information based on factors ranging from gender to class background. Family, peer groups and personal knowledge all affect how viewers evaluate news programming. Information is not merely injected into America's veins as the once popular hypodermic needle theory implied. Finally, as the global crises beome more apparent and our common future more real, interest in international events will likely increase, and Americans will hopefully seek out more information. No more can Americans assume, if they once did,

the luxury that a middle-class, peaceful and consumer-ladened future awaits them.

As educators, we have a challenge before us: to inform our students about international issues, to inspire them to learn more, and to energize them to get involved. All of this must be done despite of, or because of, the awesome and often disenfranchising power of our mass media. There are steps that can be taken, and I will suggest a few. First, we must educate ourselves and others to understand the makeup of mass media news, to demystify the million dollar anchors, the fancy special effects and the illusion that what we are watching is anything more than a social construction. Anyone interested in understanding the reality behind the news needs to develop a set of guidelines for, first, separating facts from hidden messages; second, for evaluating the remaining facts in terms of authenticity and the like; and third, to develop alternative interpretations for the information. Students must be made aware of diverse, educational and non-commercial media outlets and be taught to analyze and compare coverage. These skills, I call media literacy. It should be taught in our schools and universities.

Secondly, as citizens and media consumers, we should demand that our media system democratize. Monopoly ownership of our public information channels poses a dangerous threat to democracy and to an enlightened citizenry. More restrictions should be placed on cross-media ownership and on media conglomerates who are also major defense contractors and the like. . Minorities and women should be supported in their efforts to break the white and male ownership monopoly. I think we should expect news which really represents multiple perspectives, especially but by no means exclusively on international issues. Newsrooms should receive not only UPI and Reuters but Inter News Press, the Caribbean News Agency, the Pan-African News Agency and the Non-Aligned News Agency Pool. Diverse sources, investigative reporting and an inherent distrust of media-planned official psuedo-events should be the norm and not the exception. I would also argue that we need an

expanded definition of news, one that goes beyond the instantaneous and the sensational to the long-term, underlying, positive and developmental.

I think we should also demand more foreign television on our domestic channels. We sell *Dallas* and *Dynasty* from Singapore to Tierra Del Fuego. But, except for a few obscure foreign-language outlets, Americans only get America's eye on the world. Let the world speak for itself. How much better to enrich Americans' awareness of, sensitivity to and knowledge about other countries, cultures and peoples than by eliminating the parochialism of American media culture.

Thirdly, we need to encourage cultural exchange, cross-national dialogue and efforts by citizens around the world to share their problems, opinions and interests with each other. Travel and student and teacher exchanges, as we here know, open vistas and windows. Sometimes one is never the same. Once internationalized, sometimes the campuses will never be the same either.

Finally, and perhaps this will be the most controversial of my suggestions, American's awareness of international issues will most dramatically change once they realize their lives are intimately affected by deforestation in the Amazon, by conflict in the Middle East, by nuclear catastrophe in the Soviet Union and by oil-drenched coastlines in Alaska. America's position in the world is changing, and its policymakers, citizens and news media must recognize that cooperation must replace competition, mutual interest replace mutually assured destruction, and global awareness replace an archaic sense of national security within one's own borders.

1. "What Americans Think: Views of Development and US-Third World Relations." (1987) Washington, DC: Interaction and Overseas Development Council. p7.

2. cited, "Fact Sheet: Global Literacy." (n.d.) New York: Office of Global Education, National Council of Churches.

3. "America in Transition - The International Frontier." (25 February 1989). National Governors' Report.

4. Bagdikian, B. (1987) *The Media Monopoly.* New York: Beacon. 2nd Edition.

5. Bennett, W. L. (1983). *News: The Politics of Illusion.* New York: Longman.

6. Altheide, D. (1976). *Creating Reality.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage; Gans, H. (1979) *Deciding What's News.* New York: Pantheon; Tuchman, G. (1980) *Making News.* New York: The Free Press; Parenti, M. (1988) *Inventing Reality.* New York: SDt. Martin's.

7. The term symbolic annihilation has been used my feminist media scholars to refer to the mvedia's portrayal of women. I have appropriated it to describe the Western media's coverage -- or lack thereof -- of the Third World.

8. Laquer, W. (1983 June) "Foreign News Coverage: From Bad to Worse." *Washington Journalism Review.* p. 32.

9. Larson, J. (1984). *Television's Window on the World.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex. pp. 40, 53.

10. Ibid., p. 62.

11. Morales, W.Q. (1982) "Revolutions, Earthquakes and Latin America," in Adams, W., ed. *Television Covage of International Affairs.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

12. Herstgaard, M. (1988). *On Bended Knee: The Pres and the Reagan Presidency.* New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.

13. Morgan, M. (1989) "Television and Democracy." in Angus, I. and Jhally, S., eds. *Cultural Politics and Contemporary America.* New York: Routledge, p. 248.

14. Dahlgren, P. (1981). "Television News and the Suppression of Reflexivity." in Katz, E. and Szecsko, T., eds. *Mass Media and Social Change.* Beverly Hills: Sage.